#### JOINT ANTELOPE VALLEY AUTHORITY

## Citizen's Committee Meeting The Antelope Valley Aesthetics Package

The Antelope Valley Aesthetics Packag Presented by A.V. Design Team August 16, 2002

Meeting Began at: 2:05 p.m.

**Board Members Present:** Glenn Johnson

Citizen's Committee Members Present: Randy Stramel, Delores Lintel, Mike Morosin,

Pamela Manske, Beth Thacker, James Mastera,

LuAnn Finke, Robert Campbell

**Citizen's Committee Members Absent:** Jim Christo

**Others Present:** Bruce Sweney, Amy Cornelius, Wynn Hjermstad,

Jack Lynch, Terry Uland, Steve Clymer, Scott Sullivan, Rick Herrick, Roger Figard. Jim Cook, Cathie Bailey,

Scott Sullivan, Kent Seacrest, Tom Leikam,

Wayne Teten, Trevor Hull

### Order No. 02-01 - Call Meeting to Order - Rick Herrick

Rick Herrick from Olsson Associates representing the Antelope Valley Design Team started the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing Jack Lynch and Steve Clymer from Olsson Associates and Scott Sullivan from Erickson Sullivan Architects, also part of the Antelope Valley Design Team. The presentation was on the aesthetics & concepts for the roadway components and bridge components for Antelope Valley Project. These concepts are a refinement of those presented at the March 2002 Citizen's Committee meeting. Herrick stressed that these are still concepts and many aspects of what is being presented has not been agreed to or finalized. The purpose of the presentation was to seek out input from the Citizen's Committee.

# Order No. 02-02 - Presentation from the Design Team on the Antelope Valley Aesthetics Package

Jack Lynch and Steve Clymer - Olsson and Associates Scott Sullivan - Erickson Sullivan Architects

Olsson's staff had a Power Point presentation on the aesthetics of the roadways, bridges and materials that are being proposed for the various projects on Antelope Valley. There were also samples of the wall, light fixtures and benches on display, these can be viewed at Olsson & Associates.

Lynch discussed the opportunity for districts to be formed and logos for naming those districts. A graphic logo has been designed and is currently being used in the presentation. This logo might be used on banners and signage for the

Antelope Valley area.

Slides illustrating the intersections along the parkway from 'K' to 'Q' streets were presented with possible materials that could be used in the area: use of colored concrete, 8' width pedestrian ramps at the intersections, patterns within the colored concrete on the sidewalks, use of small 2' - 3' high walls with landscaping in front of the wall. Granite cobble paver could be used in the "no man's land" area of the sidewalk. This is an uneven and uncomfortable part of the sidewalk that would discourage people from hanging around. There is an opportunity for some small walls to be placed to identify special areas of the

Lynch:

parkway.

Medians will be a good size (35' wide) and could make use of walls 2' - 3' high. Wall materials might be limestone with a concrete cap on top and use of colored piping/banding that would show up during daylight hours and lighting along the side of the wall (only 25% of the wall would use lighting) during the night. The wall would provide opportunity to display logo to identify Antelope Parkway as a special parkway. The medians would cut the impact of a 6 lane roadway. They would have a small serpentine wall that would discourage pedestrians from cutting across mid-block across the roadway. Another series of walls would be the Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls. There could be a repeating pattern on the wall and landscaping at the base of the walls.

Sullivan:

Sullivan presented the bridge aesthetics. There was some discussion if the bridges should be different from each other or have similar features. It was decided that they should all be similar because they are all apart of the waterway. There might be pieces of the bridge that are different and unique to each neighborhood, like history plaques. Sullivan showed artist rendering slides of the 'O' Street signature bridge and the elements/materials on that bridge. Slides for the other bridges were also shown. An entrance element was desired for the signature bridge as well as a landmark in the downtown area. Key elements include: the abutments, an entrance element, center piers, and cables that are subtle in the day time but can be down-lit in the evening. Another aspect of the bridge was the ability for pedestrians to also walk through the bridge area. Each bridge would have a safety wall approximately 2½' high. One possible element is the information signs at the entrances to the bridges and the use of banners. Pedestrian lighting is another feature of the bridges to increase the security level and light certain elements of the bridge. 'P' & 'Q' Streets would have a 3-span example and are smaller than the 'O' Street bridge. These bridges would have some of the main elements of the 'O' Street bridge, but on a smaller scale. The piers would be canted and have ornamental lighting.

Lynch:

There is still discussion with the pedestrian bridges and if they should be a painted or a steel facility. Sullivan went on to discuss the street lights. They are very efficient fixtures and are smaller than what is currently seen around town. One thought was to have the banners attached to the street lights which stay fairly consistent at 6' behind the curb. These efficient lights also reduce the amount of "wash" produced and mainly light just the sidewalk in an oblong shape. There was an example on display at Olsson's of the pedestrian light that might be used along the sidewalks. It might be too contemporary, the designers are looking for input on the fixture. An example of the benches that could be used were also on display. They are from the same vendor that Urban Development uses for their benches. The final slides showed examples of a bike rack, trash receptacle, landscaping (perennials) and artwork.

Discussion:

There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the bridges. Citizen Committee members illustrated some concerns that there are the mixing of too many lines and the use of too many materials(ie-limestone and brick). It was recognized that the designers attempted to incorporate as many of the suggestions and elements that have made over time, but that unfortunately, the project has become to busy and complicated. Staff also pointed out that these renderings are not finalized and are still in discussion. Members from the Citizen's Committee stressed the need for simplicity and to reduce the complexity of the design of the bridge. It was also cautioned that the project avoid being fashionable or trendy. There was continued discussion on the banners. Concern was raised about if the banners were permanent or could be removed once they were no longer desired

or needed. The material that the banners were made of was also discussed. The sidewalk lights were re-visited in the discussion and whether the light should have one or three poles. In addition to the bridges appearing to be too busy and complicated in the slides, it was suggested that the angle of the upper structures of the 'O' Street bridge in the rendering may have had something to do with the busyness. Terry Uland contributed one possible reason for the visual confusion on the bridge renderings. He suggested that there is a heavy buttress against a thin light pole along with the cables that are pulling the buttress down to the street. It was pointed out that the designers have been very responsive to the input from the community, but in the process the project has lost some of its design integrity.

### Order No. 02-03 - Community Revitalization Update - Kent Seacrest

Kent Seacrest updated the Citizen's Committee on the status of the Community Revitalization. He presented an overview of a hand-out that was distributed (attached). Topics discussed were the East Downtown area, Neighborhood area, Waterway Zipper area, A.V. Design Team, Planning Group, Project Coordination, Market Study, Input from the Citizen's Committee and the Public, a list of RFP's, and a Proposed Meeting Schedule and timetable.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m.